UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,621	10/28/2003	Stefan Kiefer	13914-016001 / 2003P00626	3903
32864 FISH & RICHA	7590 06/07/201 ARDSON, P.C.	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 1022			FADOK, MARK A	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/695,621	KIEFER ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MARK FADOK	3625
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) MARK FADOK.	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. Richard Soderberg</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>2 June 2010</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: arguments as provided in Appeal Brief.		
Claims discussed: 13		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Mark Fadok/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the arguments as presented in the Appeal Brief were persuasive, in that the rejection as currently written was not ready to be passed on to the Board of Appeals. The examiner stated that the art that is provided in the current rejection is strong in regards to current claims and that a new rejection which more clearly presents the rejection is contemplated (may include additional references for clarity or teaching). The examiner also proposed an amendment that if agreed to may place the claims in condition for allowance. The potential allowable subject matter (previously proposed in the advisory action mailed 9/10/2009) being an amendment to the independent claims; for instance, claim 13, line 9, deteting "made available" and inserting "that the computer system presents". Support being found in applicant's PG PUB 20050091122 para 41 and 50. Mr. Soderberg asked, what was the applicant's motivation to accept such a proposal? The examiner noted that if the applicant does not chose to accept the proposal then a new final rejection necessitated by the amendment filed 2/20/2009 would be forthcoming. However, if the applicant should aggree to the proposed claim amendment then the examiner will search the claims in light of the amendment and if the combination is not reasonably found by the examiner's during the search then the application would pass to issue. If however, the combination was found in one reference or a combination of references then a new final rejection would be provided on the claims as provided in the current Appeal Brief. Mr. Soderberg indicated that he will contact the applicant and allow them to make the decision and said he would get back to the examiner later in the week.